



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

but essentially the best teaching of the centuries. They throw to the winds stereotyped homiletic traditions and have gained tremendously in directness of appeal to the modern man and woman. These preachers rightly diagnose the diseases of the present social body and do not mince words in describing modern sins. They apply the only remedy—the dynamic in Christianity. Yet, even with all their keen insight into social ailments and humanity in general, they have no message of a love, wide as the world, for all those who worship the same God “in spirit and truth” and “who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality.”

F. H. GESELBRACHT

CHICAGO, ILL.

CHRISTOLOGY IN CONTEMPORANEOUS GERMAN THOUGHT

In Arnal's treatise¹ we are brought face to face with German rationalism in its treatment of the person of Christ. The theologians considered under this classification are Biedermann, Lipsius, and Pfeiderer. They are grouped together because of their kindred Hegelianism; philosophic unity leads to dogmatic unity. Arnal employs three criteria in his criticism: logic, psychology, and history. Warmly does he champion scientific method. Religion can lay no claim to a special logic; modern science has become a part of the human spirit; there is no other way to knowledge acceptable in this day. He considers Christ as man, as superman, and as God. He is in essential agreement with the rationalists in their insistence upon the humanity of Jesus. Jesus was thoroughly a man, even in his sentiments, desires, and ideals. And to be man is to be only man. The rationalists “are in accord with the gospels and with reason; with them we must reject the dogma of the two natures.” It is impossible to emend the God-man idea so as to make it acceptable. The formulae of rationalism on this point are at fault only in not being complete. Omitting all texts of the Scripture except those that deal with the historic Jesus, rather than with his pre-existence or post-existence, there is no evidence that necessitates his divinity. Even in John's Gospel the power, glory, and knowledge of Jesus keep within human limits. They attest a personal relationship to God, but do not necessitate an essential relationship. Jesus was holy, yet not inerrant, because he was man. His holiness is the explanation of his uniqueness, and is the very core of the revelation

¹ *La personne du Christ et le rationalisme allemand contemporain.* Par André Arnal. Vol. I. Paris: Fischbacher, 1904. 424 pages. Fr. 7.50.

of Christ. Jesus was conceived as God because of the resurrection. Exegesis, psychology, or logic will not justify the theory of visions in explaining the fact of the resurrection. It is this fact upon which rests the foundation of the church and of Christian faith. It is illogical to assume at the very start that the supernatural does not exist. Because God is a free being, miracle must be admitted. Christianity itself is a miracle. Rationalism recognizes only the miracle of the world and its harmonious course. Lipsius' distinction between dogmatic miracle and supernatural religion is to be rejected. Nor dare one accept the distinction between a historic and an ideal Christ. Christ is more than an ideal; he is the historic means by which God grafted a new humanity into humanity. Accept the Hegelian philosophy of the rationalists, and their conclusions follow; but the philosophy of German rationalism must be revised, if it is to escape false elements and contradictions. Our author rejects traditional trinitarian symbols. God is the only God; Christ is not God *qua* God; the Holy Spirit is a divine influence, a divine presence in our lives. Yet the requirements of faith oblige us to accept a hypothesis of a miraculous birth, even though one other than that of Matthew or of Luke. This is necessary in order to conserve Jesus' holiness. Jesus pre-existed; nor was this pre-existence ideal. How can an abstraction pre-exist? In summation, rationalism affirms only the humanity of Jesus. It accepts his post-existence in a religious sense, but denies utterly his pre-existence. Three orders of facts may be distinguished: (1) the holiness of Christ; the resurrection of Christ; (2) the post-existence—facts that unfold in contemporary religious history; (3) the supernatural birth and pre-existence—really explicative hypotheses. Rationalism accepts only the first fact in the first order. It denies supernaturalism, but thereby denies liberty to God. In fact, God becomes a mere symbol. In the last analysis rationalism is agnosticism.

Such a work as this displays brilliancy and keenness. Rationalism is not condemned *in toto*. In fact, though Lipsius' symbolism is criticized, there is evident a sympathy with his general attitude of thought. Yet the author is not a rationalist as he understands the term. He is saved from this by his belief in miracle. Miracles he grounds in God's freedom. Against a God who is abstract he places a God who is analogous to a human personality. To do this he goes outside of rationalism and rests upon faith. He would not deny that, as against the metaphysics that rationalism destroys, he establishes a newer metaphysics. Yet his whole system falls with his concept of God. The validity of the argument of analogy as applied to God is not sure. Since he himself denies sub-

stantialism, it is difficult to see what God may be for him, if not the very ideal or abstraction he would criticize in others. Even his faith is subordinate to reason; it is evident that the gospels are. Logically he would not be able to escape from rationalism. The motive that has stimulated him is the desire to account for the holiness of Christ. He assumes that such uniqueness necessitates a unique office. He accounts for the latter by the miraculous birth and the theory of pre-existence. These point to the divinity of Christ, yet Christ is not God *qua* God. In what other sense he may be God is not clear. The problems that are left to be pondered are many. The philosophy of the rationalists is condemned without giving a substitute. The resurrection is assumed as a cardinal fact in Christianity at one moment and the holiness of Christ at another. Does this not involve the assumption of the whole solution? Is the resurrection a historic fact? And does Christ's character necessitate the conclusion that he was God? Nor is it satisfactory to ground miracle in God's character. Miracle is not to be discussed on an *a priori*, but on a historic basis, if at all. The question as to whether there is or is not a supernatural realm is in the end a matter of definition.

Schaefer,² in an article on the Christology of the confessions, follows Kaftan in distinguishing between the theology of a new faith and a modern theology of the old faith. The former involves a new religion not worthy to be termed Christian. Ritschlian theology is left out of consideration as no longer modern. Modern theology is either religio-historical in method, and therefore a new faith, or else some form of an old faith. For the former Christ ceases to be an object of faith; he is only a subject of faith. To be an object of faith Christ must be divine in his human personality. Precisely in this sense the theology of the new faith rejects the divinity of Christ. For it Christ is only a religious genius or a religious hero. Such a Christology lacks vitality. The divinity of Christ is more than a postulation; if it were not, the work of Christ would lack reality. The question is a historical one to be settled by the Scriptures. Christ's sonship to God is essential, in contrast to that of believers. The Christ of the confessionals needs reconstruction, however, for the doctrine of the two natures is untenable. Yet one must retain the virgin birth and pre-existence, or else do harm to the Christian faith. It is nonsense to believe that the world brought forth its Lord. The choice is between eternal existence and creation to explain Jesus. His own self-conscious-

² *Die Christologie der Bekenntnisse und die moderne Theologie*. Von Erich Schaefer. [In "Beiträge zur christlicher Theologie."] Heft 5. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1905. 154-226 pages. M. 1.60.

ness is alone competent to decide. The Logos doctrine affords a solution to modern Christology. The Logos is the expression of God, yet becomes man by its own willing. At the same time, Jesus did not cease to be Son of God. The death of Christ means that God's life ceased in him, the resurrection that God's life returned. It may be remarked that Jesus' self-consciousness dare not be given the value attached to it by the author. The infallibility of that consciousness would have to be established, or else it could only be accepted as an opinion and not a criterion. The naiveness of a modern theology that gives up the two-nature theory, but plunges one into other and even greater dogmatic and psychological difficulties is noticeable. Must one remain true to the Logos idea and the theory of kenosis at the expense of psychology?

WILLIAM THEODORE PAULLIN

GREEN BAY, WIS.

BRIEF MENTION

ANGUS, S. *The Sources of the First Ten Books of Augustine's De Civitate Dei*. Princeton, 1906. 279 pages. \$1.

The *De Civitate Dei* of Augustine may be considered the final expression of the attitude of the western church toward the culture of Greece and Rome. It is of the greatest importance to determine the sources from which Augustine derived his knowledge of the pagan history and literature. The direct quotations had already been indicated in the editions of Dombart and Hoffmann; but even to bring these together gives an interesting hint as to the extent of the reading of the greatest scholar of the early western church. Dr. Angus has carried on this difficult investigation with great thoroughness, and his conclusions are, in general, convincing. A few errors, however, occur; e. g., on p. 16 Apuleius seems to be credited with the authorship of the *Asclepius*, or *Hermes Trismegistus*, and on p. 201 there is an amusing misinterpretation of Augustine's statement in regard to the trial of Apuleius on the charge of magic.

In addition to the study of the sources, many other questions of interest have been considered by Dr. Angus in the commentary. Thus there is a full discussion of the impression made upon Augustine by the news of the sacking of Rome by Alaric in 410, the catastrophe that really suggested the writing of the *De Civitate*. His conclusion is: "So far as the testimony of Augustine's writings is concerned, his attitude to the fall of Rome and the state of the Roman Empire of his day was one neither of intense and deeply patriotic feeling nor of heartless indifference, though nearer the latter than the former. To say the least, he appears surprisingly calm in the face of so terrible a calamity. Augustine's pride in Rome was centered in her achievements of the *past*, not in her *present*. He was more of a Christian than a Roman." The last part of the dissertation is a discussion of Augustine's knowledge of Greek—a point of considerable importance in view of the many allusions in the *De Civitate* to Plato and the Neoplatonists. In this chapter we have an exhaustive collection of passages from several of Augustine's works, which afford direct evidence of his ability to